

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated April 19, 2006. Claims 1, 6-8, 11, 12, 14-17, 19- 26 currently stand rejected. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claim 13 is allowed. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12, 14, 16 and 19-26 to more particularly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

In light of the amendment and the remarks presented below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all now-pending claims of the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 6, 11, 12, 14-17, 19-23, 25 and 26 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Helm (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,388) in view of Acevedo (U.S. Patent No. 5,818,361). Claim 7 currently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Helm in view of Acevedo and further in view of Nomura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,700,508, hereinafter "Nomura"). Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Helm in view of Acevedo and further in view of Takala et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,788,294, hereinafter "Takala"). Claim 24 currently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Helm in view of Acevedo and further in view of Schmucker (U.S. Patent No. 5,283,401).

Independent claims 1, 12, 14, 16 and 19-26 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, that the intra-changeable elements are configured to provide an output responsive to messages received at said communication unit.

The Office Action admits that Helm fails to teach or suggest intra-changeable elements and thus, Helm necessarily also fails to teach or suggest that the intra-changeable elements are configured to provide an output responsive to messages received at said communication unit as claimed in the claimed invention. Meanwhile, the Office Action cites Acevedo as disclosing intra-changeable elements.

Acevedo is directed to a keyboard in which LCD or LED displays provide the user with indicia of the function of each key on the keyboard. In this regard, a physical characteristic of

each key (i.e., appearance, color, character displayed, etc.) may be changed to correspond to the current application (col. 4, lines 1-24). However, Acevedo discloses only that the keys having such characteristics are input devices. In this regard, the keys indicate a function associated with the key if the key should be pressed. For example, the keys include indicia that may indicate what function each key will have if pressed while playing a particular game. Alternatively, the keys may indicate corresponding foreign alphabet symbols. Meanwhile, the claimed invention contemplates use of the intra-changeable elements as both input and output devices. In this regard, as recited in the claimed invention the intra-changeable elements are configured to provide an output responsive to messages received at said communication unit. In other words, messages received at the communication unit may cause an output via the intra-changeable elements. Acevedo fails to teach or suggest use of the keys for providing an output. Furthermore, Acevedo is directed to use with games or other applications not related to communications and thus fails to teach or suggest use of the keys to provide an output responsive to messages received. Accordingly Acevedo fails to teach or suggest that the intra-changeable elements are configured to provide an output responsive to messages received at said communication unit as claimed. Nomura, Takala and Schmucker also fail to teach or suggest that the intra-changeable elements are configured to provide an output responsive to messages received at said communication unit and are not cited as such.

Since none of the cited references alone teach or suggest that the intra-changeable elements are configured to provide an output responsive to messages received at said communication unit as claimed in independent claims 1, 12, 14, 16 and 19-26, any combination of the cited references likewise fails to render independent claims 1, 12, 14, 16 and 19-26 obvious for at least the same reasons described above. Claims 6-8, 11, 15 and 17 depend either directly or indirectly from corresponding ones of independent claims 1, 14 and 16, and thus include all the recitations of their corresponding independent claims. Therefore, dependent claims 6-8, 11, 15 and 17 are patentable for at least those reasons given above for independent claims 1, 14 and 16.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 1, 6-8, 11, 14-17 and 19-26 are overcome.

Appl. No.: 10/004,815
Amdt. dated 07/18/2006
Reply to Office action of 10/04/2005

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendment and remarks submitted above, it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are in condition for immediate allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present invention.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Chad L. Thorson
Registration No. 55,675

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON JULY 18, 2006.
LEGAL02/30009955v1